

Archives and Manuscripts: a window into Australian archival writing, 1955–2011

Sigrid McCausland*

Sigrid McCausland is a Lecturer in the School of Information Studies, Charles Sturt University. She has been a professional member of the Australian Society of Archivists since 1981 and is a member of the Editorial Board of *Archives and Manuscripts*. She has published on diverse subjects, including the records series system, labour archives and online access to archives. Her current research interests include advocacy, community recordkeeping and archival history.

How does a journal published by a small professional association make an impact on the international discourse of the archival profession? How does a journal attract readers and authors from different traditions to become an internationally respected vehicle for disseminating research and documenting developments in archival and recordkeeping practice and theory across the Anglophone archives world? This article traces the journey of Archives and Manuscripts over more than 50 years, from its modest national beginnings to its consolidation as an international journal of note. It provides an overview of the writing published in Archives and Manuscripts, concentrating on the period since the formation of the Australian Society of Archivists in 1975. It takes a chronological approach, supported by an analysis of the balance between Australian and international authorship and identifying themes and trends that the journal has documented.

Keywords: archival publishing; archives; Australia; professional associations

Introduction

The purpose of this article is to provide an overview of the history of *Archives and Manuscripts*, describing its development as a professional journal, its concerns and its contribution to archival discourse in, and beyond, Australia. It begins with a summary of the origins and early years of the journal. It then considers the journal's development during three major time periods, from 1976, when it became the journal of the newly formed Australian Society of Archivists until 1990, the decade of the 1990s and the journal since 2001. Examples of major debates that occurred primarily, or at least partly, through the pages of *Archives and Manuscripts* are discussed and trends (or lack thereof) are identified. The article concludes with some speculations on the future of the journal as it enters the era of online publication.

Beginnings, from 1955 to 1975

The origins of *Archives and Manuscripts* are embedded in the story of the emergence of the archives profession in Australia. The Archives Section of the Library Association of Australia (LAA) was formed in 1955, some years after the matter of an independent voice

*Email: smccausland@csu.edu.au

for archivists and archives had first been raised.¹ The first issue of *Archives and Manuscripts* appeared later in 1955. The decision to start a journal was influenced by the American TR Schellenberg, who visited Australia in 1954 and galvanised local archival activity.² Schellenberg may have played the role of catalyst, but there was also strong local motivation to produce a journal. This pattern of related national motives and international inspirations for *Archives and Manuscripts* was to continue over the next few decades.

Archives and Manuscripts began as the organ of the Archives Section. The first issue stated that the Section's aim was 'to promote the preservation and study of Archives and Manuscripts. Its main interest lies in the Australian field but it does not exclude consideration of Archives and Manuscripts in general'. The editors, Phyllis Mander Jones and Allan Horton, wrote that '*Archives and Manuscripts* will fulfil a long-felt need in Australia'. They cautioned that its success would depend on contributions from members that would be 'of interest to archivists, custodians of manuscripts, historians and other research workers'.³ Articles, notes of the Archives' Section's activities and news would be its content, with reviews foreshadowed for future issues.⁴

In and beyond its first decade, *Archives and Manuscripts* performed a critical role as the channel of written communication for a small, widely spread and nascent profession.⁵ In the early days, manuscripts and archives both featured strongly, as members reported on how they approached their work in the manuscript sections of state libraries and in government archives. Gerald Fischer was an early contributor, whose interests were broad and scholarly. Ian Maclean wrote on 'Trends in Organising Modern Public Records' in 1956. Allan Horton's 'Techniques of an Archives Survey' (August 1960) was effectively a primer for both archivists and manuscript librarians. Manuscript practice was covered to an extent not seen later. In retrospect, this may not be so surprising, as the major government archival institutions were yet to emerge, and there were few other avenues for employment.

The earliest international contributions were in 1957 when TR Schellenberg's 'The Arrangement of Private Papers' was published in the same issue (volume 1, number 4) as FH Rogers's 'Recent Archival Activities in New Zealand'. It is worth remarking that these should be from such a significant figure in early Australian archival development and from New Zealand, with whom Australia has shared so much of its archival history.⁶

Reporting major news was an important role for *Archives and Manuscripts* during a time of expansion and change in the Australian archival landscape. The struggle to establish a separate identity for archivists was continuing. In November 1959, a review of an LAA report on archives and libraries argued that Australia, like other countries, deserved specialised archival institutions and staff.⁷ In 1961, the journal noted the birth of two new institutions, the Archives Office of New South Wales and the Commonwealth Archives Office, after the separation of the archives from the libraries in these two jurisdictions. Australian archivists were keenly interested in learning about what was happening overseas, and there are several reports of study visits to Europe and North America. One prescient example is Margaret Medcalf's report 'Archivist or Records Keeper', which expresses surprise at the distinction between the work (and status) of archivists and records managers in Germany, compared to the more inclusive Australian practice.⁸

The familiar structure of *Archives and Manuscripts* over the decades, with some variations, appeared early on. Content was typically divided into articles, reviews, news notes and publication notes. There were some variations on this, technical notes and articles on conservation being a feature until the late-1970s. Until the bi-monthly newsletter, *The Bulletin*, began publication in 1977, *Archives and Manuscripts* was the only avenue for reporting national archival news. From 1977, the Australian Society of

Archivists (ASA) usually published the proceedings of its biennial and, from 1992, its annual conferences. In some cases, *Archives and Manuscripts* became the destination for conference papers by chance, rather than policy.⁹

The critical event in the early history of the journal was the appointment of Robert (Bob) Sharman as editor in 1960. Bob made it his objective to keep *Archives and Manuscripts* alive, until it could be handed over to a professional association of archivists for archivists.¹⁰ He was to hold the fort for 15 years; and he, and others, have testified that, without him, it may not have survived. By June 1973, Bob was increasingly despairing of the paucity of copy received for the journal and now working in a library himself. He appealed to Australian archivists to write for their journal and to take up the challenge of establishing their own association or to find another editor. Michael Saclier and others responded by forming a steering committee to guide the process towards an independent organisation for archivists.¹¹ In the same year, the Canadian W Kaye Lamb visited Australia at the invitation of the Australian Government. The resulting *Lamb Report* on a National Archives System for Australia was significant, even if ultimately not implemented by the government which had commissioned it.¹² The journal's first special issue, on Papua New Guinea, was published in August 1975 to mark that country's independence from Australia.¹³

This was a watershed year for Australian archivists. The inaugural general meeting of the newly established Australian Society of Archivists (ASA) was held in April 1975. The Archives Section of the Library Association of Australia was dissolved and its journal, *Archives and Manuscripts*, was handed over to the new society. Bob Sharman achieved his goal of remaining steward of the journal until an association of archivists was formed.¹⁴

Expanding horizons, from 1976 to 1990

Andrew Lemon was the new editor, and the first issue that he edited included an appreciation of the contribution (thus far) of Bob Sharman to the archival profession and a major article on education for archivists by Peter Orlovich, Lecturer in charge of the Diploma of Archives Administration at the University of New South Wales – the

Table 1. Special and themed issues.

Issue	Title	Editor/s
August 1975	Papua New Guinea	Bob Sharman
May 1993	A simple shared goal: accountability through recordkeeping	Glenda Acland
May 1994	Electronic recordkeeping: issues and perspectives	Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward
May 1996	Personal recordkeeping: issues and perspectives	Adrian Cunningham
November 1998	Recordkeeping and the law	Livia Iacovino
November 1999	Business records	Bruce Smith
November 2001	How well have we documented the twentieth century?	Maggie Shapley
May 2003	Appraisal	Cassie Findlay
May 2005	Collective memory	Glenda Acland
November 2008	Archives: discovery and exploration	Karen Anderson

first university qualification offered in archives in Australia.¹⁵ Lemon later acknowledged his relative inexperience as both an archivist and an editor, while at the same time emphasising the hopes that he and his colleagues felt for the new ASA.¹⁶

In August 1978, ‘Archives and Administrative Change Part 1’ – the first of five articles by Peter Scott written in conjunction with various colleagues at Australian Archives (Commonwealth Archives Office until 1974, but then known as Australian Archives until 1998, after which it became National Archives of Australia – source: <http://www.naa.gov.au/about-us/organisation/history/index.aspx>) – appeared. These articles, published over the next three years, elaborated on the theory and substantiated the claims of Scott’s 1966 *American Archivist* article. They comprised the major statement of the Commonwealth Records Series (CRS) system for the wider professional public, and, this time, they were not met with spirited responses from records group practitioners.¹⁷

Baiba Irving (Berzins) became editor in 1979. She believed that her predecessor had left a journal that was expressing an independent voice, appropriate for a new society shaping its own future. Her predecessor had left little copy, however, so Baiba used a mix of strategies to attract copy, including commissioning articles by approaching friends, former students and colleagues from other disciplines to contribute. She viewed the *American Archivist* as an inspiration for *Archives and Manuscripts*, not out of any need to imitate, but rather because she liked its liveliness.¹⁸ Baiba herself had a strong international orientation and noted a paradox: ‘The who, how and why of archive-keeping ... attracts little interest in Australia, although internationally, the reputation of some of our institutions and practitioners is high’.¹⁹ The contemporary experience in Canada was somewhat similar. Gordon Dodds, a former editor of *Archivaria*, wrote that Canadian archivists were reluctant authors, that editors had to work hard to shape the journal and that articles that asked the ‘why’ questions were unusual.²⁰

Archives and Manuscripts aspired to encourage debate and not to remain entirely on safe ground. Don Brech, editor in 1982, expressed the hope that:

The articles and reviews touch on issues of public and professional concern, on archival development, opportunities and dangers. If they provoke thought and discussion, particularly among those with influence in the professional and public corridors of power, this journal will have achieved its purpose.²¹

In 1982, the call for nominations for editor acknowledged the reach of *Archives and Manuscripts* and *The Bulletin*, describing them as: ‘... the means by which the Society is known outside the ranks of its members, both in Australia and overseas, and are a vital means of disseminating information and communicating within the profession’.²²

Nancy Lutton was editor from 1983 to 1987 and identified the following types of material as suitable for publication:

Papers given at seminars and similar meetings are often a rich source, but accounts of the operations of our great variety of institutions are especially welcome. Others may wish to discuss archival principles, or education, or highlight the problems associated with particular materials.²³

Nancy introduced ‘International Notes’ as a section in 1985, and, fittingly, the first issue contained a report of the seminar for the Pacific Regional Branch of the International Council on Archives (PARBICA). Nancy’s editorials were generally brief, but the ASA

records show how she managed the journal and corresponded with section editors from Perth, supporting and mentoring them.²⁴

The thirtieth anniversary of *Archives and Manuscripts* and the tenth anniversary of the ASA were both celebrated in 1985. In their reminiscences on the occasion, several past editors decried the difficulty of getting copy and of managing the physical production and distribution of the journal. However, they also warmly recalled the rewards of working with colleagues and of the journal's contribution to the Australian archival endeavour in general. Andrew Lemon described *Archives and Manuscripts* as the ASA's 'most tangible success'.²⁵

In mid 1987, the ASA published *Keeping Archives* – the result of a longstanding volunteer project by a group of Sydney-based archivists led by Ann Pederson. While this volume could no more claim to be a representative voice of Australian archival practice than *Archives and Manuscripts*, it raised the profile of the Australian profession internationally and sustained the ASA's finances. Henceforth, Australian archival practice and Australian archivists would be recognised in the professional literature through more than one title.

Averil Condren – editor from 1987 to 1989 – brought knowledge of publishing professional journals in other disciplines to the role. She created the first editorial board, deliberately named to align with international practice, whose main function she envisaged as 'being the Editor's safety net cum quality control inspectors'.²⁶ She considered one solution to the problem of the dearth of contributions was to look overseas, because there were more archivists there than in Australia (she also encouraged contributions via her editorials and by identifying possible themes and topics for future issues). Averil suggested that *Archives and Manuscripts* should seek international members for its editorial board, although this was not taken up.²⁷ She introduced 'In the Agora' – a new section designed for short contentious pieces. Not many members took advantage of this platform, and it generally served as a place for self-contained essays that were not taken up in subsequent issues.

By 1990, *Archives and Manuscripts* had begun to see the return of contributions by Australian Archives staff.²⁸ Clive Smith, as editor, remarked that disposal was now receiving due, if belated, attention.²⁹ Reviews were increasing in number, and the material reviewed was being drawn from a broadening pool of publications, both local and international. However, most articles were still likely to report innovations in practice, to describe holdings in particular archives or to discuss professional issues of the moment. Theory and principle were less frequently addressed, as Colin Smith had noted in his 1989 comparison of *Archives and Manuscripts* and *Archivaria*. Colin felt that Australians were 'apparently uninterested in the big picture'.³⁰ Things would change in the next decade.

The 1990s – the stellar decade

By 1991, a bright future for *Archives and Manuscripts* as the vehicle for reporting Australian developments and the engagement of Australian archivists and archival theorists with their international colleagues in the electronic records field seemed likely. The 'Keeping Data' seminar in October 1990, sponsored by the ASA and the Australian Council of Archives, was an important catalyst for developments in electronic records' thinking and writing in Australia. Glenda Acland's paper from that event, 'Archivist – Keeper, Undertaker or Auditor', appeared in *Archives and Manuscripts* in May 1991. This, and her subsequent 'Managing the Record, Not the Relic' (May 1992), were early

forceful statements of the need for archivists to reinvent themselves for the electronic world. Eric Ketelaar has noted that these articles became classics immediately.³¹ The work of archivists who had become academics, Sue McKemmish, Frank Upward and Livia Iacovino at Monash University, began to appear in *Archives and Manuscripts*.

The early-1990s was a particularly fertile time for archival publishing in Australia. As well as *Archives and Manuscripts*, there were other significant publications, some involving the ASA and some not. In 1993, the second edition of *Keeping Archives* (edited by Judith Ellis) was published and, in 1994, *The Records Continuum: Ian Maclean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years* (edited by Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott). In 1995, the Australian Capital Territory branch of the ASA published *Debates and Discourses: Selected Australian Writings on Archival Theory 1951–1990*. This volume reprinted some articles that had originally been published in *Archives and Manuscripts*, including some of the responses to Scott on the record group and the Powell–Hurley debate on personal papers.³² Other contributions had originally been published elsewhere – an indication that *Archives and Manuscripts* had never been the only destination for Australian archival writing.

Another form of international communication, visits to Australia by significant international practitioners and theorists became frequent during the 1990s, and international contributions to the journal increased markedly in the second half of the decade (see Figure 1). David Bearman and Terry Cook were explicit about the impact of their Australian sojourns on their work. Terry Cook's internationally acclaimed 'Electronic Records, Paper Minds' appeared in *Archives and Manuscripts* in November 1994. Eric Ketelaar began his long interaction with the Australian profession at the ASA conference in 1992. 'The Right to Know and the Right to Forget? Personal Information in Public Archives' – his first contribution to *Archives and Manuscripts* – appeared in May 1995. Education was a focus in this period, and the word *recordkeeping* appeared more frequently.




Figure 1. Australian and international contributions.

Note: Authors by nationality. Australian is defined as 'working in Australia at the time of publication'.

Michael Piggott, as editor, marked 40 years by noting that *Archives and Manuscripts* was not the whole story of the ASA. Much that was important happened elsewhere – in seminars, branch meetings and on listservs. Despite sharing the anxiety of previous editors about attracting ‘material of high quality, originality and relevance to our diverse readership’, he considered that the November 1995 issue, which included ‘electronic records, principles, debates linked to descriptive standards, records continuum perspectives, education, technology and accessibility, the state of the ASA’, was a fair representation of the interests of the Australian profession at the time.³³ During the 1990s, the ‘Reviews’ section (under Glenda Acland and then Adrian Cunningham) also blossomed: not only books, but reports, audiovisual resources, conferences and exhibitions were reviewed, expanding the breadth and liveliness of *Archives and Manuscripts*.

As the decade progressed, a succession of theme issues appeared: beginning with electronic recordkeeping in May 1994 (edited by Glenda Acland), then personal recordkeeping in May 1996 (edited by Adrian Cunningham) and recordkeeping and the law in November 1998 (edited by Livia Iacovino). These issues highlighted important contemporary concerns and demonstrated the high quality of contributions offered to the journal, as well as the scholarly stature of the guest editors. Frank Upward’s pioneering work ‘Structuring the Records Continuum’ appeared in the November 1996 and May 1997 issues. Barbara Reed raised the question ‘Metadata: Core Record or Core Business?’ in November 1997. Articles from leading international practitioners and academics now appeared every year. Sue McKemmish described *Archives and Manuscripts* as an academic journal and first raised the issue of electronic publication in her editorial of May 1997. Looking back, there are some important developments in the 1990s that did not receive attention in *Archives and Manuscripts* at the time, notably the work that eventuated in the Australian Standard on Records Management, AS4390, and the development of the first set of national competency standards for records and archives in Australia. And while appraisal was a fairly frequent subject for writers, the Heiner Affair generally took a minor role, rather than being centre stage.³⁴

In 1996, the ASA instituted the Mander Jones awards for publications on archives. The breadth of the winners over the years affirms the strength and diversity of ‘archival publishing’ in Australia and the ASA’s role in supporting and encouraging individuals and institutions alike to seek recognition for professional activities that have resulted in publication.³⁵

Creating and documenting controversies

‘Editors inevitably aim to produce journals which reflect the diverse range of members’ interests, to inform, to challenge and find room for heresy’, or so Michael Piggott told his American audience.³⁶ Bob Sharman recalled that, among his stratagems to attract contributions for the journal, he resorted to writing the ‘controversial material’ himself.³⁷ There were instances where this was not required. Australian reactions to Peter Scott’s groundbreaking 1966 *American Archivist* piece on the limitations of the record group concept were presented through the pages of *Archives and Manuscripts*. There were some strong defenders of the record group, who made it clear that the ideas and practices associated with the CRS system were, as yet, neither well-known nor implemented outside the Commonwealth Archives Office.³⁸

In 1976, Andrew Lemon received a significant unsolicited contribution on personal papers from Graeme Powell, ‘Archival Principles and the Treatment of Personal Papers’. The author explored the difficulties of applying the archival principle of origi-

nal order when working with personal papers in a manuscript library context. A strong rejoinder from Chris Hurley, 'Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles', followed in the next issue. This exchange became known as the Powell–Hurley debate and clearly demonstrated the divergence in theory and practice between the manuscript branch of the National Library of Australia (Powell) and the Australian Archives (Hurley).³⁹

In 1995, Michael Piggott considered that, in its 40 years, *Archives and Manuscripts* had 'been better at reflecting the status quo than deepening an understanding of our knowledge base or at critically analysing institutional policies and practices'.⁴⁰ There had been no analysis of the closure or downgrading of government and bank archives, nor of a recent high-level government recordkeeping scandal – the 'white board affair'.⁴¹ 'In the Agora' alerted readers to the crisis created by the removal of Chris Hurley from the position of Keeper of the Public Record Office Victoria in 1990,⁴² but there was no discussion of the background to this event or its implications.

By the early-2000s, *Archives and Manuscripts* had reached the stage of maturity where controversies centred on its own pages could emerge. The May 2001 issue carried Verne Harris' response to Sue McKemmish's 1996 'Evidence of Me' and Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish's counter-response to Harris. This exchange traversed the territory of postmodernism, personal recordkeeping and the evidence versus memory debate. Likewise, the provocative piece by Paul Macpherson on providing public access in May 2002 spurred a spirited response from records continuum advocates, including Barbara Reed, Sue McKemmish, Eric Ketelaar and Michael Piggott. With others, they contributed to a themed issue on collective memory that explored the fourth (pluralising) dimension of the records continuum.⁴³ Macpherson also attracted a response from American appraisal archivist Matthew Eidson, who argued for a more inclusive approach to the relationship between access and appraisal for both life cycle and continuum practitioners.⁴⁴

In 2010, Macpherson's next polemic was on the issue of the conflict between providing online and on-site access to archives, where he argued that the old paradigm of providing on-site services continued to prevail, eclipsing the needs of online researchers, specifically at the National Archives of Australia (NAA). Paul Dalglish of NAA responded in May 2011 with an argument that complexities in the records and in human behaviour required a more nuanced approach to online access.⁴⁵

For all its international prominence, the Heiner Affair has not figured strongly in *Archives and Manuscripts*. The May 2011 issue included Randall Jimerson's piece 'Ripples Across the Pond: Global Implications of the Heiner Affair' and Sebastian Gurciullo's interview with Kevin Lindeberg, which redressed the balance. Perhaps it is sometimes easier to write about controversies in international journals than at home. As a journal with no direct government support operating in a landscape dominated by the large government archives, *Archives and Manuscripts* has reasons to be circumspect. Yet one controversy involving conflict between one institution and its parent was thoroughly documented in Ray Edmondson's series of articles on the crisis at the National Film and Sound Archive and its eventual fortunate outcome.⁴⁶

Meaningful trends?

From 1976, *Archives and Manuscripts* continued to present reports from practitioners and developments in an emerging profession. In fact, until the 1990s, the tone of *Archives and Manuscripts* continued to be practical and report on experience, rather

than writing on theory – a parallel to the experience of the *American Archivist* in its formative period, as characterised by Richard Cox.⁴⁷ *Archives and Manuscripts* was an omnibus, rather than a narrowly specialised journal. While international submissions were published more regularly than in the early years, there was no inexorable trend towards more content from international authors, even allowing for a generous definition of *international*, as Figure 1 illustrates. This does not mean that articles were largely introspective or written with, or for, an Australian sensibility only. Perhaps one enduring characteristic of the Australian profession is that it has tended to look outwards and to be concerned with avoiding a limited national focus.

Archives and Manuscripts has documented, if imperfectly, the preoccupations of Australian archivists over time. The concerns of the ASA's special interest groups – collecting archives; local government; school; university; business, labour and corporate; religious collections; reference, access and public programs; Indigenous issues; and electronic records – have all been represented over the years, if inconsistently and sparingly in some cases. Likewise, key professional concerns, including education and archives (and related) legislation, have attracted sporadic, rather than consistent, interest.

It is clear that the journal has archives, not manuscripts, at its heart. This may reflect the growth in number and influence of archives as institutions and the relatively static position of manuscript libraries in Australia over time. The issue of the relationship between archives and manuscripts was considered by Peter Crush in his 1989 ASA presidential conference address, where he described the separate paths taken by archivists and those responsible for historical manuscripts in Australia and other countries. He hoped that there was a continuing place for archives in libraries, but also that librarians would understand that archives were different and required different methods.⁴⁸ Another explanation for the change over time is the dominance that the innovations of the series system and continuum thinking have had on archival practice in Australia: there is no equivalent manuscript tradition.⁴⁹ However, personal recordkeeping and the personal in the record have not been neglected; in fact, they may be considered as a particular strength of *Archives and Manuscripts*. Apart from the May 1996 special issue, there have been contributions from Chris Hurley, Eric Ketelaar, Michael Piggott and, more recently, Anne Marie Condé on personal recordkeeping.⁵⁰ This concentration transcends the old archives versus manuscripts cleavage, encompassing both government and private spheres, both physical and digital records.

From the editors' perspective, there was one trend – the uncertainty of receiving enough copy that they wished to see published, as Michael Piggott noted in his fortieth anniversary editorial: 'As earlier editors will confirm, it is a constant challenge to gather material of high quality, originality and relevance to our diverse readership, and in sufficient quantity to allow the luxury of selection'.⁵¹

2000 and beyond

The new millennium did not signal a change of direction. New editor Maggie Shapley reported on a 1998 survey of members concerning the journal. She noted that survey respondents had been clear that the purpose of *Archives and Manuscripts* was to educate and inform, rather than to encourage Australian archivists to publish or to be a forum for scholarly communication. She also recorded that readers wanted both Australian and overseas content and that there was overwhelming agreement that the whole recordkeeping continuum should be covered. Suggestions about new content

favoured case studies, best practice and material relevant to small archives, as well as more student papers.⁵²

Maggie introduced new rules for refereeing articles and saw through the process of appointing a new editorial board. Both of these steps were necessary for the journal to meet the requirements for inclusion on the Australian Department of Education, Science and Training's Register of Refereed Journals.⁵³ The significance of these actions was to ensure that academic contributors – Australian and international alike – would continue to view *Archives and Manuscripts* as a suitable place to publish their research. Local practitioners continued to contribute, but there were an increasing number of articles from international academics and students who had either never been to Australia or did not have any connection to the Australian profession.

In 2005, *Archives and Manuscripts* proudly celebrated 50 years. There was a new cover design and the editorial was a joint effort between Katherine Gallen, representing a new generation of archivists, and Bob Sharman, who retold the early history of the journal in the context of the struggle of the emergence of the Australian archives profession.⁵⁴ This was followed by an assessment of the journal by Eric Ketelaar, who reported that more than 150 individuals and institutions outside Australia received the journal as members or subscribers. He went on to discuss the importance of *Archives and Manuscripts* as a meeting place for the writing of highly regarded international and Australian archivists. He used examples from course reading lists in North America and Europe to underline the international influence of Australian writing, showing that articles from *Archives and Manuscripts* were read and frequently cited abroad. Ketelaar supported early editors Gibbney and Sharman in their contention that the measure of *Archives and Manuscripts*' prestige in the wider archival world was found not only in its own pages, but also in the contributions of its authors to other journals.⁵⁵

In 2007, the advertisement for a new editor for *Archives and Manuscripts* stated that: '[i]t is recognised by its worldwide audience as one of the leading professional journals for archivists and other recordkeeping and information professionals'.⁵⁶ To have reached this point was an achievement for a journal that had been produced over the decades by volunteer labour and had been almost entirely sustained by membership dues and institutional subscriptions.⁵⁷

Recent years have seen the journal continue its history of publishing articles on diverse subjects, including information policy, education, metadata, recordkeeping and identity and appraisal. Monash University researchers, increasingly in collaboration with international colleagues, have published several articles on their work on Indigenous recordkeeping, providing readers with a twenty-first century agenda for addressing a range of issues relating to Indigenous knowledge. These articles have reported major research projects, but have also challenged readers to adopt a more inclusive societal perspective on their work as recordkeepers – one which extends to acknowledging and acting on their knowledge of the power of records as sources documenting human rights.⁵⁸

In July 2009, a review group considered the future of *Archives and Manuscripts* and reported its findings to the ASA Council. Among its main recommendations were to retain the journal's title, while seeking an appropriate subtitle to link it to its Australasian location and to proceed with exploring options for electronic publication. There was also a commitment to continuing diverse content for a broad readership and the aspiration that the journal would be recognised on the international stage as comparable to the *American Archivist* and *Archivaria*. It was also decided to seek international members for the editorial board.⁵⁹ A 'Reflections' section has since been introduced, in

order to extend the range of content and to provide a place for more contentious comment – in effect, an updated equivalent of ‘In the Agora’.

Conclusion

Archives and Manuscripts developed from a modest typescript in the mid twentieth century to an internationally respected online journal in the early twenty-first century. Many editors and section editors and many more authors of articles, reviews and news items have contributed to the many thousands of words that have delighted, stimulated, enlightened, irritated and bemused its readers over time. The ASA and its predecessor, the Archives Section of the Library Association of Australia, have been proud parents of a lively child, which has helped carve out and then enhance their international reputations. But the path to international fame has not always been smooth, given the constant anxieties of editors (now permanently lessened) concerning how to attract submissions that are relevant and of sufficient quality to publish. The title of the journal has not reflected the balance of its content since its early days: it has been an archives journal, not a manuscripts one. Today, the journal looks forward at a time when traditional practices and mindsets are under challenge; the digital future, for some, looks clear, but for others, it still seems uncertain. Australian archivists and their international colleagues have, in *Archives and Manuscripts*, a rich resource of past professional endeavour and a strong vehicle for future discussion and reflection: it is up to them to continue to nurture a valued publishing institution.

Endnotes

1. While there are some histories of key institutions, there is no general history of the archives profession in Australia or of Australian archival writing. The chapters by Adrian Cunningham, ‘Archival Institutions’, and Ann Pederson, ‘Professing Archives: A Very Human Enterprise’, in Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed and Frank Upward (eds), *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, Centre for Information Studies, Wagga Wagga, 2005, pp. 21–50; 51–74, provide some context for the history and character of the Australian archives profession. Terry Eastwood, ‘Reflections on the Development of Archives in Canada and Australia’, in *Papers and Proceedings of the 7th Biennial Conference of the Australian Society of Archivists, Inc.*, Australian Society of Archivists, Hobart, 1989, pp. 75–81, provides an analysis of the contrasting Canadian and Australian experiences at the national level. Michael Piggott, *Archives and Societal Provenance: Australian Essays*, Chandos Publishing, Oxford (forthcoming) is likely to shed more light on the broad history of the Australian profession and on its internal conflicts. Directly related to the concerns of this article is Bob Sharman, ‘Introduction’, in P Biskup, K Dan, C McEwen, G O’Shea and G Powell (eds), *Debates and Discourses: Selected Australian Writings on Archival Theory 1951–1990*, ASA, Canberra, 1995, pp. 1–14 and Michael Piggott, ‘Archives and Manuscripts: Panel Contribution to Society of American Archivists Annual Meeting Session Professional Journals and Archivists, 2 September 1995’ (copy held in the Noel Butlin Archives Centre, Australian National University, N187/852, Correspondence with Managing Editor and Council Reports, 1994–1995).
2. Participants in the Schellenberg seminars published two issues of an unofficial Bulletin of the Australian Archivists.
3. *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 1, no. 1, November 1955, p. 1.
4. *ibid.*
5. In this, the Archives Section of the LAA was like other groups of enthusiastic professionals, who established journals for the purpose of sharing information about their work, see G Page, R Campbell and J Meadows (eds), *Journal Publishing*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, p. 2.

6. In the last two decades, an Australasian archival identity has formed, as demonstrated in the name of the government archives group, the Council of Australasian Archives and Records Authorities and in the title of the ASA's 2007 publication, *Describing Archives in Context: A Guide to Australasian Practice*.
7. Archives Section Committee, 'Report on Archives and Libraries', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 1, no. 6, November 1959, p. 28.
8. *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 2, no. 5, June 1963, pp. 6–8.
9. Publishing the conference papers was usually the responsibility of the local branch hosting the conference. Selected papers from the 1975, 1979, 1991, 1992 and 2008 conferences were published in *Archives and Manuscripts*.
10. Bob Sharman, 'Archives and Manuscripts – Fifty Years', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 2, November 2005, p. 11.
11. Bob Sharman, 'Periodical Fits of Morality', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 13, no. 2, November 1985, pp. 118–26; Michael Saclier, 'The Australian Society of Archivists: The First Five Years', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 8, no. 1, June 1980, pp. 4–5 and 'Ten Years of the Australian Society of Archivists: In Retrospect', vol. 13, no. 2, November 1985, pp. 145–7 and Baiba Berzins 'Why an ASA?', in Michael Piggott and Colleen McEwen (eds), *Archivists – The Image and Future of the Profession*, 1995 Conference Proceedings, Australian Society of Archivists, Canberra, 1996, p. 6.
12. Lamb held a seminar in Canberra on September 1973. The background document for the seminar was reproduced in the November 1973 issue of *Archives and Manuscripts*.
13. See Table 1 for a list of special and themed issues.
14. Bob Sharman, 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 39, no. 2, November 2011, p. 11.
15. For the history of archival education at the University of New South Wales (UNSW), see Sigrid McCausland, 'Educating Archivists in Australia and Beyond: The Contribution of the UNSW Archives Course 1973–2000', *Comma*, no. 1, 2011, pp. 79–87.
16. Andrew Lemon, 'Into the Great Unknown', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 13, no. 2, November 1985, pp. 126–9.
17. The five articles were republished in the ASA publication of the works of Peter Scott and Adrian Cunningham (ed.), *The Arrangement and Description of Archives Amid Administrative and Technological Change: Essays and Reflections By and About Peter J. Scott*, Australian Society of Archivists Inc., Brisbane, 2010.
18. Baiba Berzins, 'From White to Red', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 13, no. 2, November 1985, pp. 130–3.
19. Baiba Irving, 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 8, no. 1, June 1980, p. 2.
20. Gordon Dodds, 'Canadian Archival Literature: A Bird's-Eye View', *Archivaria*, no. 17, Winter 1983–4, pp. 37–8.
21. 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 10, no. 1, May 1982, p. 6.
22. Noel Butlin Archive Centre (NBAC), Australian National University, Records of the Australian Society of Archivists (ASA), N187/830, Correspondence with Editorial Committee, 1982–1987.
23. Records of the Australian Society of Archivists, Noel Butlin Archives Centre, Australian National University, N187, 830.
24. *ibid.*
25. Lemon, p. 127.
26. NBAC, ASA: N187/832, Editorial Board – circulated notes – meeting summaries, 1987 – 1989.
27. NBAC, N187/832.
28. For example, Bruce Arnold and Marian Hoy, 'The CRS Manual', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 16, no. 2, November 1988, pp. 91–95; Steve Abrahamffy, Kathryn Dan, Michael McCarthy, Greg O'Shea, Kerrie Scott and Steve Stuckey, 'Disposal in the Australian Archives – New Challenges and New Directions', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 18, no. 2, November 1990, pp. 203–212.
29. 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 18, no. 1, May 1990.
30. Colin Smith, 'Australian Archives Through a Looking Glass', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 17, no. 1, May 1989, pp. 59–60. Colin considered that Canadian archivists were more interested in philosophical debates. Jay Atherton's analysis of *Archivaria* indicates there was a fairly even spread between professional issues, case studies, sources, documentation and the-

- ory in the years from 1976 to 1994; see 'The Contribution of *Archivaria* to the Development of the Canadian Archival Profession', *American Archivist*, vol. 57, no. 2, Spring 1994, p. 274.
31. See Eric Ketelaar, 'Transaustralian *Archives and Manuscripts*', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 2, November 2005, p. 15.
 32. This publication was reviewed in *Archives and Manuscripts* by two educators – one Australian (Peter Orlovich) and one Italian–Canadian (Luciana Duranti).
 33. 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 23, no. 2, November 1995, p. 226.
 34. *Archives and Manuscripts*, May 2001 included articles by Russell Kelly of the National Archives of Australia and Tony Newton of State Records New South Wales on experiences with appraisal under the new national records management standard, AS4390. Later, in May 2003, there was a special issue on appraisal.
 35. For details about the awards, see the ASA webpage on the Mander Jones Awards, available at http://www.archivists.org.au/page/Learning_and_Publications/Recognising_Excellence_-_ASA_Awards_and_Scholarships/Mander_Jones_Awards/, accessed 30 October 2012.
 36. Piggott, p. 3.
 37. 'Periodical Fits of Morality', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 13, no. 2, November 1985, p. 122.
 38. The record group versus series system debate features in Sharman, *Debates and Discourses*, pp. 79–100; 116–131.
 39. This debate was selected for inclusion in *Debates and discourses*.
 40. NBAC, ASA: N187/852, Correspondence with Managing Editor and Council Reports, 1994–1995.
 41. Piggott, p. 7.
 42. Sue McKemmish and Frank Upward, 'Chris Hurley', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 18, no. 2, November 1990.
 43. Paul Macpherson, 'Theory, Standards and Implicit Assumptions: Public Access to Post-Cur-rent Government Records', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 30, no. 1, May 2002, pp. 6–17. Macpherson's position was that records continuum thinking had a blind spot concerning public access to archives. The May 2005 themed issue, edited by Glenda Acland, was based on papers from the seminar 'Archives and Collective Memory' organised by Monash University and held in August 2004.
 44. 'Beyond the Purview of Recordkeeping: A Response to Paul Macpherson', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 32, no. 1, May 2004, pp. 64–73.
 45. See Paul Macpherson, 'Building a Better Horse and Buggy: The Privileging of Access in Reading Rooms Over Online Access', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 38, no. 2, November 2010, pp. 61–78 and Paul Dalglish, 'The Thorniest Area: Making Collections Accessible Online While Respecting Individual and Community Sensitivities', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 39, no. 1, May 2011, pp. 67–84.
 46. See Ray Edmondson, 'A Case of Mistaken Identity', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 30, no. 1, May 2002; 'What's a Nice Archive Like you Doing in a Place Like This?', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 32, no. 2, November 2004 (In the Agora); and 'The National Film and Sound Archive and Australian Film Commission: The End of the Affair', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 39, no. 2, November 2011 (Reflections).
 47. Richard Cox, 'American Archival Literature: Expanding Horizons and Continuing Needs, 1901–1987', *American Archivist*, vol. 50, no. 3, Summer 1987, pp. 309–12.
 48. Peter Crush, 'Archives and Manuscripts', reprinted in *Debates and Discourses*, pp. 204–17.
 49. In writing on appraisal, Barbara Reed noted that she had taken care to be inclusive of collect-ing archives practice, so as to present a balanced picture in her article, 'Exploration of Australian Archival Practice: Part 1', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 31, no. 1, May 2003, pp. 63–82.
 50. Chapters by Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of Me ... In a Digital World' and Adrian Cunningham, 'Ghosts in the Machine: Towards a Principles-Based Approach to Making and Keeping Digital Records', in Society of American Archivists' recent publication, see Christopher A Lee (ed.), *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, Society of American Archivists, Chicago, 2011, pp. 115–148; 78–89. This publication indicates respect for Australian scholarship in the area of personal recordkeeping.

51. Michael Piggott, 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 23, no. 2, November 1995, p. 226.
52. 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 28, no. 1, May 2000, pp. 6–7.
53. The first fully refereed issue under the new arrangements was published in November 2002.
54. *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 2, November 2005, pp. 8–12.
55. Eric Ketelaar, 'Transaustralian *Archives and Manuscripts*', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 33, no. 2, November 2005, pp. 14–17. On Australian archivists' publishing elsewhere, see, also, Michael Piggott, 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol. 23, no. 2, November 1995, p. 227.
56. ASA, *Bulletin*, no. 4, August 2007, p. 21.
57. It was also a testimony to the work of the editors, managing editors and editorial board members who provided expertise and advice to the ASA Council on matters relating to publishing its journals. Among these, Shauna Hicks stands out for having served as managing editor for two long stints and for guiding *Archives and Manuscripts* towards electronic publication.
58. See, especially, *Archives and Manuscripts*, May 2006, November 2006, May 2007, November 2009 and May 2010 issues.
59. Sebastian Gurciullo, 'Editorial', *Archives and Manuscripts*, vol., no., May 2010, pp. 10–11.